

1 ROBERT IAN STRINGHAM, SBN 324878  
2 California Legal Research  
3 1922 N Highland Avenue #28  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90068  
5 215-275-1112  
6 ianstringham@californialegalresearch.org

7 TASHA ALYSSA HILL, SBN 301865  
8 The Hill Law Firm  
9 5132 York Blvd. #50681  
10 Los Angeles, CA 90042  
11 484-282-3836  
12 tashahilllaw@gmail.com

13 Attorneys for Petitioner

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
**FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

ADRIAN RISKIN,

Petitioner,

vs.

CITY OF LOS ANGELES,

Respondent.

Case No.

**Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate  
Ordering Compliance with the California  
Public Records Act**

[Government Code §§ 6250 *et seq.*; Code of  
Civil Procedure § 1085]

1 Petitioner Adrian Riskin petitions this Court for a writ of mandate requiring Respondent City of Los  
2 Angeles to immediately make available to Petitioner public records lawfully requested by Petitioner  
3 pursuant to the California Public Records Act (“CPRA”), Government Code § 6250, *et seq.* Petitioner also  
4 respectfully requests that this Court grant relief in the form of costs of suit, attorney’s fees, and other  
5 appropriate and just relief resulting from Respondent’s unlawful conduct. Petitioner alleges as follows:

## 6 **PARTIES**

7 1. Petitioner Dr. Adrian Riskin is a resident of Los Angeles, a professor at a local college, and an  
8 open records activist. Using CPRA requests to investigate and understand the activities of the Los Angeles  
9 City government, Riskin makes all his findings freely available to the public through blogging and  
10 community events. His collection of records have helped both researchers and the public at large learn  
11 about the city’s response to the homelessness crisis, including students at U.C. Berkeley School of Law’s  
12 Policy Advocacy Clinic, and documentary filmmakers producing a film about the Greater West  
13 Hollywood Food Coalition. Records obtained by Riskin have also been featured as part of an exhibit at  
14 the Los Angeles Poverty Department – Skid Row History Museum. Moreover, Riskin has helped to  
15 empower the public by publishing a guide to the practical use of the CPRA in the City of Los Angeles.  
16 Riskin is a member of the public within the meaning of §§ 6252(b)-(c).

17 2. Respondent City of Los Angeles is a local agency within the meaning of Government Code §  
18 6252(a).

## 19 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

20 3. This court has jurisdiction over this petition pursuant to Government Code §§ 6258 & 6259 and  
21 Code of Civil Procedure § 1085.

22 4. Venue is proper in this Court. The records in question, or some portion of them, are situated in the  
23 County of Los Angeles. *See* Gov’t Code § 6259(a). Also, Respondent city is located in the County of Los  
24 Angeles. *See* Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a).

## 25 **GENERAL ALLEGATIONS**

26 5. This dispute arises from the failure of the City of Los Angeles to respond to a request for public  
27 records.  
28

1       6. In the summer of 2019, it became publicly known that Los Angeles Police Department (“LAPD”)  
2 officers were participating in two private Facebook groups: “Crimebusters of West Hills and Woodland  
3 Hills” and “Homeless Transient Encampments of our West Valley.” Following numerous complaints by  
4 homelessness advocates about demeaning comments, anti-homeless sentiments, and promotion of  
5 vigilantism on both pages, LAPD conducted a formal investigation of officer participation in the groups.

6       7. On July 16, 2019, Petitioner made a records request through email on Respondent pursuant to the  
7 CPRA. He sent the email to Tran Le, the Director of Communications for CD7 Councilwoman Monica  
8 Rodriguez. The request sought for emails between Councilwoman Rodriguez and CD7 staff regarding  
9 officers and private citizens who are known to have participated in these Facebook groups. The request  
10 specified a timeframe, specified a list of senders and receivers, and specified a series of keywords to search  
11 for. A true and correct copy of the request is attached as Exhibit A.

12       8. On July 16, 2019, when Petitioner received an automated away message from Ms. Lee, Petitioner  
13 immediately forwarded the request to CD7 staff members Doug Tripp and Denaee Amaya per by the away  
14 message’s instructions. True and correct copies of the away message and Petitioner’s forwarded email are  
15 attached as Exhibits B and C respectively.

16       9. Ms. Le acknowledged receipt of the email on July 19, 2019. She estimated that, due to the “volume  
17 of the search terms” Respondent would provide an answer as to whether or not responsive records existed  
18 by August 9, 2019, 21 days later. A true and correct copy of this correspondence is attached as Exhibit D.

19       10. Given that the response time was outside of the typical 10-day CPRA response deadline, Petitioner  
20 assumed Respondent was implicitly extending the deadline by an additional 14 days as allowed for by  
21 CPRA § 6253(c) in “unusual circumstances.”

22       11. On August 23, 2019, 35 days after his initial request and 11 days after expiration of the 14-day  
23 extension, Petitioner had received no response and emailed Respondent regarding the status of his request.  
24 Petitioner also sought clarification as to how the “volume of the search terms” amounted to a reason for  
25 delay, as the, “City’s Gmail system can be searched for multiple keywords in a single operation, so that  
26 there is no practical difference between searching for one keyword or a thousand.” A true and correct copy  
27 of this correspondence is attached as Exhibit E.

28     ///

12. On September 16, 2019, 58 days after his initial request and 34 days after expiration of the 14-day extension, Petitioner had not received any response and emailed regarding the status of his request. A true and correct copy of this correspondence is attached as Exhibit F.

13. On October 7, 2019, 80 days after his initial request and 56 days after expiration of the 14-day extension, Petitioner had still not received any response and again emailed regarding the status of his request. A true and correct copy of this correspondence is attached as Exhibit G.

14. Since Respondent's July 19, 2019 email, Petitioner has not received any response from Respondent regarding his July 16, 2019 CPRA request.

### CAUSE OF ACTION

#### **For Violations of the California Public Records Act, Gov't Code § 6250 *et seq.***

15. Petitioner realleges and incorporates by reference the preceding paragraphs in this Petition.

16. Pursuant to Government Code § 6258, any persons may "institute proceeding for injunctive or declaratory relief or writ of mandate in any court of competent jurisdiction to enforce his or her right to inspect or receive a copy of any public record or class of public records under this chapter."

17. The records Petitioner seeks are public records, i.e., writings related to the conduct of the public's business.

18. Upon information and belief, Petitioner alleges that Respondent prepared, retained, used, or has control or constructive possession of public records that are responsive to Petitioner's request.

19. Petitioner alleges in accordance with Government Code § 6259(a) that the information it seeks from Respondent is maintained in Los Angeles County.

20. Respondent's failure to provide responsive public records violates the CPRA.

21. Petitioner requests that this Court issue a writ of mandate compelling Respondent to release the requested records.

### REQUEST FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully requests judgement as follows:

1. That the Court issue a peremptory writ of mandate directing Respondent to make all requested documents available for inspection and provide a quote for direct costs of duplication of the records within 10 days of this Court's order directing that they do so;

2. That the Court enter an order awarding Petitioner his costs of suit and reasonable attorney's fees and costs incurred in bringing this litigation;

3. For such other relief as this Court deems just and proper.

Dated: XXXXXX

By: /s/ Robert Ian Stringham  
Robert Ian Stringham

By: /s/ Tasha Alyssa Hill  
Tasha Alyssa Hill

Attorneys for Petitioner

**VERIFICATION**

I, Adrian Riskin, have read the foregoing Petition for Writ of Mandate and know the contents thereof.  
The same is true of my own knowledge, except as to those matters alleged on information and belief,  
and, as to those matters, I also believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on \_\_\_\_\_, in Los Angeles, California.

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Adrian Riskin